



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Israelites, and Arabs and other Mohammedan peoples; in the second, the Greeks claim the lion's share of his attention, but all sorts of peoples, related or unrelated to the Greeks, likewise are passed in review. To the classical student the heads under which the materials relative to Greece are grouped will doubtless prove to be of the greatest interest. They are as follows: I, "Cult and Myth"; II, "Homer and Hesiod"; III, "Agriculture, Weather, etc."; IV, "Legislation, Politics, and the Pythagoreans"; V, "Hippocrates"; VI, "Later Medicine"; VII, "Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, etc." Throughout the author distinguishes between periods of forty days and those of forty years, and then groups together the somewhat miscellaneous mass of other uses of the number. He arrives at the conclusion that the sacred or mystical character of the number forty was derived from the primitive observations touching various forty-day periods, such as that of the continuance of the menstrual discharge after the inception of pregnancy and that of the lochial discharge after parturition. Other periods of like duration were noted relative to wind and weather. From this sphere the conception spread so as to cover various terms of forty years, such as the almost ubiquitous forty-year generation with its ἀκμή at the fortieth year.

Dr. Roscher properly emphasizes the comparative aspects of his investigations; for, though—doubtless in a large measure because of lack of knowledge on our part—the parallelism between all the peoples compared is by no means complete, nothing is more calculated to impress the student than the actual extent of agreement disclosed between peoples of the most different ethnological affiliations. Every such study properly conducted, as are those of Dr. Roscher, contributes substantially to the stock of primitive ideas, the constitutive and regulative significance of which for the development of human conceptions and institutions we are just beginning adequately to realize, and so to the science of folk-psychology and the beginnings of science. The author has once more given striking proof of the inexhaustible riches of that storehouse of primitive notions, the writings of Hippocrates; and incidentally he offers valuable suggestions, looking to the improvement of the text of not a few passages, based upon a thorough knowledge of the subjects under discussion. One can but hope that the erudite and indefatigable investigator may continue to shed light upon questions of this kind.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

The Common People of Ancient Rome. Studies of Roman Life and Literature. By FRANK FROST ABBOTT. New York: Scribner, 1911. Pp. xii+290.

In everything written by Professor Abbott we have learned long since to look for soundness of scholarship as well as clarity of presentation; and both of these expected qualities are exhibited in his latest volume. *The*

Common People of Ancient Rome is evidently intended to make the past more vividly real and near; but in pursuit of this laudable aim it never descends to methods that are sensational or sentimental, and the book should appeal to any intelligent reader with an interest in history, whether he has a special classical training or not. To the friends of Latin and Greek it will be welcome also as a pertinent argument to be wielded in the presence of facile and familiar phrases about "arid fields, exhausted soil, unproductive methods, and dreary technicalities."

The nature of the contents may perhaps be gathered more satisfactorily from the chapter headings than from the title, so I quote a few of them: "How Latin Became the Language of the World"; "The Poetry of the Common People"; "Diocletian's Edict and the High Cost of Living"; "Some Reflections on Corporations and Trade-Guilds." With the exception of "The Origin of the Realistic Romance among the Romans," the papers are now published for the first time. If the reader is inclined to question whether the comprehensive general title is quite justified, he may recall that *Society and Politics in Ancient Rome* is really a companion volume.

After voicing a genuine commendation of the work, one might submit a few suggestions like the following: (1) It would hardly seem worth while devoting so much space to Grober's theory that the different developments of Latin in the Romance languages were due primarily to the time of the original Roman acquisition and settlement of the respective districts (pp. 23-26). Naturally Professor Abbott himself does not accept this untenable view. (2) "The speech of the common people . . . is usually much more rigid in its adherence to its own principles than formal speech is, which is likely to be influenced by conventional associations" (pp. 32-33). We may readily accept the essential point of the paragraph; but the careful reader will view that particular sentence very suspiciously. (3) The verses scratched on a temple wall at Memphis by a Roman lady tourist (p. 113) can scarcely be taken as an example of the "Poetry of the Common People," unless a trip up the Nile was a much more frequent diversion of the plebs than we have always assumed. (4) In dealing with the "Edict of Diocletian" it might have been well to emphasize more strongly the significance of the fact, pointed out long ago by Dureau de La Malle, that the prices of provisions thereby enjoined were not merely low, but so low that the imperial effort broke down utterly and immediately. Furthermore, even the actual relative value of wages and the prices of supplies may fail to be reliably indicated by the edict, despite the general assumption to the contrary. For if there was an error in the scale of wages that did not happen to counterbalance the error in the scale of prices, the economic relation would be materially modified. We should be glad to know whether Diocletian's policy aimed at benefiting the poor man in both arms of the balance or only in one. However, Professor Abbott's comparison of the purchasing value of the working-man's day in that period and our own is helped by the introduction of a careful

tabulation and renders a real service. (5) The many translations of Latin passages are invariably accurate, as one would expect. That they did not always strike the present reviewer as being felicitous, is only a proof that a former student may some day presumptuously differ from an honored master.

Typographical slips are creditably rare, although *bletat* (p. 102) is rather startling. One must regret the printing of words and phrases from various languages in the same type as English words, the few exceptions in the text only serving to emphasize the confusion.

FRED B. R. HELLEMS

Sophokles. Erklärt von F. W. SCHNEIDEWIN und A. NAUCK. Zweites Bändchen: *König Oedipus*. Elfte Auflage besorgt von EWALD BRUHN. Berlin: Weidmann, 1910. Pp. 239. M. 2. 20.

Sixty years ago Schneidewin first published his school edition of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. At his death in 1856 the work of revising his *Sophocles* passed into the hands of the great conjectural critic, August Nauck, who issued one edition of the plays after another, the ninth of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* appearing in 1886. Bruhn published the tenth in 1897.

In text and commentary the present edition is an improvement on its predecessor. This manifests itself in some cases, viz., vss. 667, 840, 1182, 1309, 1461, in the rejection of conjectures adopted in the tenth edition, in favor of the reading of the MSS. But in 463 and 806 also the reading of L and other codices should have been kept, as in the previous edition. Bruhn now reads *εἶδε* in 463, but, in support of *εἶπε* and the participle, cf. Soph. *El.* 676, *O.C.* 1580, Plat. *Gorg.* 481c, etc.; and he adopts Robert's conjecture *τῆς τροχλάτου* in 806 in preference to the MS reading *τὸν τροχλάτην*, which occurs in the same story in Eur. *Phoen.* 39.

Vs. 13. Bruhn would omit *οὐ*. This is wrong; cf. Dem. 19, 123, Philem. 213, Herod. 2, 110, Plat. *Lys.* 212d, etc. *μὴ οὐκ ἔχων* in 221 illustrates the same principle, but here the editor without warrant gives to each negative a separate negative force. Vs. 31. *σέ* is governed by *κρίνοντες*, not by *ἐξόμεσθ' ἐφύσσιοι*. Vss. 44 f. Bruhn construes *βουλευμάτων* with *ἐνμφορὰς* in the sense of "advice contributed (*συμφέρειν*) by others." For a better interpretation in which *βουλευμάτων* is made to depend on *ζώσας μάλιστα*, cf. *Classical Philology* II 94 f. Vs. 360. The reading adopted in the text *ἡ πέρα λέγειν* is inferior to *ἡ 'κπειρᾶ λόγων*, which is implied in L and supported by a scholium. Vs. 586. There is nothing "indefinite" about the protasis *εἰ . . . ἕξει* (= *μέλλει ἕξειν*). Vs. 624. Bruhn still maintains that 624 is "a meaningless remnant of a longer debate between Oedipus and Creon." Vss. 656 f. The editor reads *μηδέποτε' αἰτία σ' ἐν ἀφανεί λόγων*. If emendation is needed—and this is doubtful—Seidler's *μηποτ' ἐν αἰτία σύ γ' ἀφανεί λόγων* is to be preferred. Vs. 659. Clearness and symmetry demand *φυγῇ* rather than *φυγεῖν*. Vss. 702 f. M. Seyffert's